DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 766 TM 011 051

AUTHOR Greene, Jennifer C.
TITLE Participatory Evaluation and the Evaluation of Social Programs: Lessons Learned from the Field.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Participation; Participative Decision Making; Policy Formation; *Program Evaluation; *Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS *Participatory Evaluation; *Stakeholder Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Issues associated with involvement of social program participants in program evaluation are analyzed. Although there seems to be a broad consensus of the need for participatory evaluation, the proposed rationales and concomitant benefits to evaluation practice appear to be quite diverse. Key issues include the rationale for "stakeholder" participation, definition of the "stakeholder," definition of meaningful participation, types of evaluation and evaluation settings most appropriate for participatory approaches, roles of the participatory evaluator, and costs of participatory evaluation. Each issue is analyzed, and prescriptive upshots of the analysis are outlined. Viewing the optimal scientific process as democratic, one realizes that participatory approaches to program evaluation can fill one important niche in the desired linkage between social science and social policy/program delivery. (TJH)

Participatory Evaluation and the Evaluation of Social Programs: Lessons Learned from the Field

Jennifer C. Greene

Cornell University

Paper presented for a Symposium on Participatory Evaluation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1986.

Participatory Evaluation and the Evaluation of Social Programs: Lessons Learned from the Field

One of the central themes in the field of program evaluation today is the involvement of program stakeholders in the evaluation process. While not a new idea (e.g., see Weiss, 1983a), stakeholder participation is currently being advocated from such diverse perspectives as responsive evaluation (Guba & Lincoln, 1981), evaluation as negotiation (Guba & Lincoln, 1985), utilization-focused evaluation (Patton, 1978), postpositivist critical multiplism (Cook, 1985), stakeholder-based evaluation (Bryk, 1983; Gold, 1981), and "program improvement" evaluation (Cronbach & Associates, 1980). Yet, within this consensus on the need for stakeholder participation, there is considerable diversity of proposed rationales and concomitant benefits to evaluation practice. In addition, for most of these rationales, neither the theoretical nor the operational elements of stakeholder participation are very well developed or understood. Such understanding, however, is required for the advancement of participatory approaches as viable evaluation alternatives. It is toward this understanding that this paper is offered. More specifically, this paper shares lessons learned from the field about several key issues related to the theory and practice of participatory evaluation. These issues and lessons are summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

The primary field context for this discussion is a multiyear research study investigating selected aspects of participatory evaluation. Using a case study methodology, two participatory evaluations are being conducted in cooperation with two small local human service agencies (a county day care council and a city youth bureau). The participatory approach being used in this study is grounded in a utilization rationale. That is, the goal of enhancing evaluation use has guided all theoretical assessments and operational decisions about stakeholder participation. For this reason, many of the field-based lessons shared in this discussion are relevant to utilization-oriented participatory evaluation, but may or may not extend to participatory approaches guided by other rationales.

Lessons Learned

What is the rationale for stakeholder participation in program evaluation?

The issue. As noted, stakeholder participation in the evaluation process has been advocated for several different purposes, including (a) increased utilization of evaluation results, (b) empowerment of especially lower status stakeholders, and (c) greater congruence between evaluation and decision making processes (Mark & Shotland, 1985a; Weiss, 1983b). A fourth rationale, (d) greater scientific validity or credibility of evaluation results, is suggested by the participatory emphasis of proponents of both "naturalistic" evaluation (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, 1985) and "postpositivist" evaluation (Cook, 1985). For the former, participation is required for meaningful phenomenological

understanding, while for the latter, multiplicity of participants is one means to triangulate on valid results.

Lessons. One of the lessons learned about the rationale for stakeholder participation in evaluation is that the theory and operationalization of stakeholder participation differ for different rationales. Thus, relatedly, it can be difficult to engage multiple rationales within a single participatory evaluation. For example, the criteria used to define and select stakeholder participants include (a) for a utilization rationale, program knowledge and status as a potential evaluation user, (b) for an empowerment rationale, low hierarchical status, (c) for a decision making rationale, status and power as a decision maker, and (d) for a validity/credibility rationale, diversity of perspectives. While not necessarily conflicting, these alternative criteria are not necessarily complementary either. As a second example, participation itself is conceptualized somewhat differently within the different rationales. Key to meaningful participation within a utilization rationale is stakeholder control over decisions about substance or content. Within an empowerment rationale, stakeholder participation in decisions about process is equally important. Both of these examples are addressed more fully below as separate issues.

A second lesson learned concerns the meaning of utilization within a utilization rationale. Because participatory approaches are distinguished more by their process than by their products, utilization considerations should encompass both process and

product. Further, following Leviton and Hughes (1981) and others, utilization should be conceptualized broadly to include instrumental (concrete, action-oriented), conceptual (educational), and symbolic (persuasive, political) evaluation uses. For example, with this conceptualization, stakeholders involved in our two participatory evaluation case studies reported a number of conceptual and symbolic "benefits" or uses of their participation in the evaluation design process. These included learning more about and generating additional publicity for the program (Greene, 1985).

A final lesson learned about participatory rationales pertains to their viability, both theoretically and operationally. The utilization rationale has some extant empirical support, though more from studies of discrete factors related to evaluation use (e.g., Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979; Thompson & King, 1981) than from wholesale implementations of participatory approaches (though see Bryk, 1983; Donmoyer, 1983; Patton, nd; Smoler, 1984). Results to date from our own participatory research project support this trend, but also underscore the considerable challenge of implementation. Regarding other rationales, allow me simply to share my less informed thoughts. First, for empowerment, I wonder if evaluation is the best or even an appropriate strategy for the political goal of empowerment (see also Mark & Shotland, 1985a). Second, doesn't the decision making rationale still presume a rational model of decision making or still presume that information can and will be regularly used to inform decisions? And hasn't

this assumption been severely questionned of late (Weiss, 1983b)? Third, the largely methodological nature of the validity/credibility rationale is appropriately and well supported by existing methodological arguments.

Who is a stakeholder? And who decides who is a stakeholder?

The issue. Following the original architect of stakeholder-based evaluation (Gold, 1981, 1983), the stakeholder concept is commonly defined as people whose lives are affected by the program and people whose decisions can affect the future of the program. As argued by Stake (1975, 1983), the essence of this concept implies risk and investment in the evaluand and is integrally related to issues of fairness and justice. Stakeholders are not simply people with information needs and thus potential evaluation users, but rather people with a vested interest in the evaluand, an interest or stake that can be lost, improved, protected, or treated (un)fairly. With this same conceptualization, Guba and Lincoln (1981) identify all of the following as possible stakeholders in any evaluation setting: (a) people involving in developing and using the evaluand (program developers, funders of development efforts, current and future adapters, current funders, agency administrators, program staff, agency Boards, evaluation sponsors); (b) beneficiaries of the evaluand (direct and indirect); and (c) groups suffering a disadvantage related to the evaluand (groups excluded from participation, groups experiencing negative effects, groups suffering political disadvantage, groups suffering from lost opportunities and/or resources).

Mark and Shotland (1985a) extend this conceptualization by discussing the values inherent in selecting stakeholder participants for an evaluation and by linking contrasting values to different participatory rationales. For example, utilization and decision making rationales both call for high-power stakeholder participants, while an empowerment rationale intentionally seeks to involve low-power or low-status participants.

Finally, in this context, Weiss (1983b) has questionned the participatory assumption that there are program stakeholders who want an evaluation and are willing to participate in the process. While her own analysis lends support to this assumption, it is nonetheless germane to the present discussion.

Lessons. The lessons learned from the field regarding the definition and selection of stakeholder are twofold. First, our research has suggested that an appropriate candidate for participation in a utilization-oriented participatory evaluation is (a) a legitimate program stakeholder (a la Gold, 1981), (b) who has enough program knowledge to contribute to the process in ways meaningful to him/her and to the process, and(c) who defines him/herself as a participant (Greene, 1985). That is, as implied by the first criterion, we did not find a link between the appropriateness (feasibility, meaningfulness, usefulness) of stakeholders as participants and their own power and status vis-a-vis the evaluand, as suggested by Mark and Shotland (1985a). Our stakeholder participants spanned a spectrum of power, which had little relation to the appropriateness of their participation.

Rather, as implied by the second two criteria, appropriate participant status was linked to sufficient program knowledge, e.g., "I really don't know that much about how XXX [program] operates...so, I didn't see myself as a major contributor," and to stakeholders' willingness to place priority on their participation. This willingness, in turn, covaried with the strength and importance of stakeholders' own stake in the evaluation, which was largely self-defined, e.g., "I feel that they [XXX program] have done me such a service, so I'd like to help them in whatever I can" (client stakeholder), compared to, "Here was a rather small part of my job and I was being asked a lot of detailed information on a hat that I wear only 10 to 15% of the time" (other-agency stakeholder). It should be reemphasized that these criteria are offered only for a participatory approach with a utilization rationale. Particularly the second criterion concerning sufficient program knowledge might be rejected by an empowerment-based participatory approach which emphasizes the evaluator's educational role and responsibilities. Finally, back to a utilization rationale, the empirical lack of support for Mark and Shotland's suggested need for high-power stakeholders may be related to or confounded by the kind of evaluation being conducted (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1983). This issue is also addressed separately below.

The second lesson learned about identifying stakeholders for a participatory evaluation concerns their actual selection. For this lesson, however, much remains to be learned. In our

utilization-oriented participatory case studies, we relied on the in-house perspective of agency administrators and program staff to select relevant stakeholder groups (from a Guba-and-Lincoln-like set) and to identify individuals within these groups as participants, using representativeness and diversity of perspective as major criteria. This procedure worked well, in that both initial groups of stakeholders were highly diverse and included, for example, individuals who were dissatisfied with the program. Yet, before advocating use of this procedure, the following concerns should be addressed.

1. Representativeness and diversity are selection criteria under the logic that multiple perspectives from relevant constituent groups will contribute to the identification of the most important, i.e., useful, evaluation priorities and will facilitate multiple evaluation uses. Of concern here are the values inherent in this logic (Mark and Shotland, 1985a) and possible weaknesses in the argument.

2. Should "sufficient program knowledge" be added to the selection criteria, thus inevitably narrowing the candidate pool, but also avoiding possible negative "costs" of participation to those lacking such knowledge?

3. What problems are incurred when stakeholder selectors have strong biases? What kinds of biases are particularly problematic? In such instances, what alternative selection procedures can be used?

What is meaningful participation?

The issue. The developers of the various participatory evaluation approaches consistently define stakeholder participation as shared decision making, rather than just advising or providing input to evaluation decisions. Stakeholders are "collaborators in inquiry" (Stake, 1983:18). This consensus notwithstanding, the operational challenges of a shared decision making process are considerable (Greene, 1985; Murray, 1983). In addition, Weiss (1983b) has questionned the fundamental assumption of at least utilization-oriented participatory evaluation that stakeholders can identify in advance what they would like to learn from an evaluation. Greene (1985) and Mark and Shotland (1985a) have questioned the implications for meaningful participation of stakeholder limitations in understanding the technical elements of evaluation. Mark and Shotland (1985a) have also suggested links between the desired nature and extensiveness of stakeholder participation and the varying participatory rationales.

Lessons. The lessons learned from our research project about meaningful participation under a utilization rationale include the following, summarized here briefly. First, the operational challenges remain considerable; so, participatory procedures remain a priority area for research and development. Second, stakeholders can identify in advance their information needs, and a variety of procedures exist for this purpose, including our own four-phase question-identification procedure (Greene, 1985), multiattribute utility scaling (Edwards & Newman. 1982), structured

conceptualization (Trochim & Linton, in press), and time-honored Delphi techniques. Moreover, the time and resources required by such procedures are not only worth it, but in fact essential to realizing the utilization promise of participatory evaluation. In other words, in the absence of meaningful stakeholder participation in the initial identification of evaluation questions, utilization potential is substantially decreased.

Third, in the shared decision making model developed in our research project, the evaluator has responsibility for structuring and guiding the evaluation process and for conducting all of the technical work, including data collection, analysis, and maintenance of technical quality. Stakeholders are then responsible for identifying and directing the substantive or programmatic content of the evaluation. Responsibility here does not preclude participation by others. For example, stakeholders could and did participate in data collection, and evaluators could and did contribute to substantive discussions. To date, the process and products of these case study participatory evaluations have received satisfactory marks when graded on both utilization and technical criteria. This suggests that this shared decision making model has a future. Finally, additional salient elements of this model are (a) the importance of providing tangible evidence of individuals' contributions to decisions, (b) the particular effectiveness of group discussions for this purpose, and (c) the value of iteration, or the provision of multiple and cumulative opportunities for participation, to the effectiveness of the model.

For what kinds of evaluation and evaluation settings are participatory approaches most appropriate or most likely to be effective?

__issue. Several authors have suggested that participatory approaches are better suited to formative, process, or implementation evaluations than to goal-oriented or summative evaluations (e.g., Cohen, 1983; Stake, 1983; Weiss, 1983b). This is because the information needs of many stakeholders are likely to revolve around practical, operational aspects of program implementation (Cohen, 1983). In addition, formative or process evaluation designs are often less rigid than summative designs and thus can more flexibly respond to changes or shifts in participants' information needs (Weiss, 1983b).

Relatedly, the inherent pluralism of all participatory approaches has implications for appropriate evaluation settings. Pluralism is embedded in all participatory rationales and thus permeates many aspects of the evaluation process, from the generation of evaluation priorities to the interpretation and use of evaluation results. This departure from reliance on a single evaluator or evaluation team, or the democratization of the evaluation process, is one of the most salient characteristics of participatory approaches. This shift to pluralism, however, remains encumbered by several concerns about the degree to which a single study can effectively address the diverse and, at times, inevitably conflicting needs of multiple stakeholders. These concerns include problems of achieving consensus on evaluation priorities (Weiss, 1983a, 1983b); of invoking an arbitrator role

for evaluators, making them responsible "for adjudicating among rival interests (including their own)"[1] (Cohen, 1983:93); and of undermining technical quality and, concomitantly, fulfillment of identified evaluation purposes by trying to be all things to all people. For example, Stake (1983:25) observed that in one of the initial large scale trials of the stakeholder approach, "[t]he attempt to be useful to many may in fact have prevented it from being useful to any."

These concerns about pluralism could imply that participatory approaches are best suited to evaluation settings that are relatively free from conflict and contentiousness. This suggestion, however, could very well seriously restrict the applicability of participatory approaches, as well as render moot a given rationale, e.g., to surface the heretofore hidden and divergent views of low-status stakeholders. More commonly, these concerns about pluralism have yielded a call for multiple studies, each addressing, for example, the concerns of different stakeholder groups (Cohen, 1983; Weiss, 1983b). This call has also been echoed in other quarters, for different though complementary reasons (Campbell, 1984; Cook 1985; Cronbach & Associates, 1980).

Lessons. Regarding this issue of appropriate evaluation types and settings, the lessons learned from our field project confirm a couple of suggestions in the literature, specifically:

1. the appropriateness of participatory approaches for process evaluations. In both case studies, program implementation questions were identified as top evaluation priorities, and in both, the

flexibility of our process evaluation designs allowed for iteration and shifts in data collection and analysis plans.

2. the appropriateness of participatory approaches in small, local evaluation settings that are relatively free from conflict and contentiousness. The agencies participating in our research project are both small, local agencies that are decentralized, collegial, and participatory themselves. Further, few conflicts of even a minor nature surfaced during either evaluation process.

Given this evident lack of contrasts, however, our findings do little to inform these and other related concerns, which therefore remain important topics for further study.

What roles are required of a participatory evaluator?

The issue. Gold (1983) has acknowledged that "the express purpose of the stakeholder approach [is] to change role relationships between evaluators and users" (p. 67). Elaborating on this premise, others have contended that, in addition to the traditional methodological/technical expert, the participatory evaluator's roles include teacher, learner, facilitator, and arbitrator or negotiator (Greene, 1984; Mark & Shotland, 1985a; Weiss, 1983a, 1983b; see also note 1). As teacher, the evaluator educates stakeholders about the potential and limits of evaluation and/or the advantages and disadvantages of alternative methods. As learner, the evaluator seeks to understand stakeholders' multiple perspectives and views. As facilitator, the evaluator facilitates and enhances the process of group decision making. And as arbitrator, the evaluator negotiates and

"orchestrate[s] the involvement of diverse interest groups" (Weiss, 1983a:10). In this context, Weiss (1983a) has wondered whether these multiple role expectations for participatory evaluators are unreasonably high. And Greene (1984) has singled out the skills required for effective group facilitation as posing particular challenges for traditionally trained evaluators.

Lessons. The major lesson learned from our participatory evaluation case studies is that, indeed, the roles of a participatory evaluator are multiple and diverse. In these studies, the evaluators served as technical experts, technical advisers, teachers, learners, and facilitators. The arbitrator role was not required, primarily due to the aforementioned lack of conflicts. The second lesson learned was that each role does require a distinct set of skills and, for this evaluator, the facilitator role was the most difficult. That is, my technical skills and teaching experience provided good support for all roles except that of facilitator, where my lack of training was, at times, acutely obvious. Finally, because it may be unreasonable to expect a single evaluator to have all these requisite skills, not to mention the mediation skills required of a negotiator, participatory evaluators may need to consider a team approach.

What are the costs of participatory evaluation?

The issue. One obvious set of costs incurred in all participatory approaches to evaluation relates to increased burden, especially the additional time required of both evaluators and stakeholders, but also the additional skills required of both and

the risk of divisiveness and conflict (Greene, 1985; Mark and Shotland, 1985a; Murray, 1983; Weiss, 1983b). Secondly, concerns have surfaced about possible tensions or conflicts between responsiveness to participatory political/organizational demands on evaluation and maintenance of technical/methodological evaluation standards of quality (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1983; Cohen, 1983; Greene, 1983, 1985; Murray, 1983; Patton; nd; Shapiro, 1983). These concerns have been raised particularly for utilization-oriented participatory approaches as conflicts between efforts to maximize use and efforts to maximize quality. However, possible conflicts between responsiveness and technical responsibility can be readily anticipated for empowerment and decision making participatory rationales as well.

A third and related cost of participatory approaches, argued most strongly by Bryk and Raudenbush (1983), concerns threats to the knowledge production function of evaluation. This argument is posed within the context of evaluating demonstration programs. Bryk and Raudenbush contend that in this context the primary stakeholders are not program staff or decision makers, but rather the research community or those social scientists who are concerned about the problem and who contemplate alternative remedies. Moreover, "evaluators' social responsibility in assessing demonstration programs implies norms for their conduct that resemble the norms of social science" (p. 99). Yet, the "exclusive emphasis on use of evaluation findings [in the stakeholder-based approach]

seems likely to compromise the knowledge productivity of applied social science" (p. 105).

Responses to this argument are threefold. First, as noted previously, participatory approaches may not be well suited to evaluations of demonstration programs in which researchers are the designated primary audience. Rather, process or implementation evaluations intended for program staff and decision makers as primary audiences may be the best forum for participatory approaches. Second, while the research community clearly constitutes a legitimate stakeholder group, it was precisely the dominance of evaluations that responded primarily to researchers' information needs that prompted the emergence of participatory approaches. According to Weiss (1983a), such evaluations were viewed as largely narrow, unrealistic, irrelevant, unfair, and unused. Finally, the contention that program knowledge or theory is the exclusive province of the research community is being increasingly challenged. One form of this challenge suggests that it is not scientific theory, but rather the "local theory" understood by program staff and administrators that most directly affects service delivery (e.g., Cohen, 1983; Trochim, 1985). So, particularly in the context of evaluation for program improvement purposes, generating, understanding, and enhancing this local theory is a viable and important function of evaluation. Even more pointedly, following Weiss (1983b:91), such conceptual or "enlightenment" uses of evaluation may be the most appropriate and realistic goal for participatory approaches to evaluation.

Lessons. The lessons learned about costs from our two participatory evaluations supported many of these themes in the literature. With respect to burden, stakeholders did report time-related costs, though not so much the time required of them individually as that required by the overall process. Relatedly, several stakeholders experienced the process as quite disjointed. For the evaluators, this approach also required additional time, as well as the additional skills noted previously. Regarding conflicts with technical quality, a final assessment here awaits the results of an external review of evaluation quality, currently in process. At this point, our preliminary assessment suggests that the particular shared decision making model used avoided possible conflicts between use-oriented responsiveness and maintenance of technical quality. While allocating to stakeholders control over substantive issues, this model gave to the evaluators control over the structure and direction of the process and thus latitude to safeguard technical quality. Finally, the suggested threats to the knowledge production function of evaluation are not really germane to our participatory case studies, given their specified internal program improvement purposes. However, in this context, both evaluations did serve, in part, to generate, describe, and assess local theory. The usefulness of these results is currently being tracked.

Conclusions

Thoughtful and concerned applied social scientists want to contribute positively to effective and just social policy and

program delivery. We "seek to improve [policymakers' and program deliverers'] conceptualizations by widening and clarifying the range of...choices, pointing out complexities that may be overlooked, and providing new perspectives... Social scientists also seek to provide information that is useful in policymaking [and program delivery] by documenting problems, monitoring implementation, and evaluating...alternatives" (Mark & Shotland, 1985b:366-367).

This paper has suggested that, with a view of the scientific process as more fitting a democratic one, participatory approaches to program evaluation can fill one important niche in this desired linkage between social science and social policy/program delivery. The lessons learned to date about participatory evaluation support its contributive potential to this knowledge. They also begin to define and circumscribe this potential by identifying relevant contextual parameters. That is, like any other evaluation approach, a participatory one is not a panacea. Finally, like all good teaching, the lessons learned about participatory evaluation most importantly include further questions that need answering.

Notes

This research was supported by New York State Hatch Grant #325410.

[1]In Guba and Lincoln's (1985) "fourth generation" model of evaluation, the evaluator's primary role is as a negotiator of pluralistic perspectives and interpretations. That is, in this model, the arbitration/negotiation role for evaluators occupies center stage and is viewed as positive and constructive, not as a problem.

References

Alkin, M.C., Daillak, R., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bryk, A.S. (Ed.) (1983). Stakeholder-based evaluation. New Directions for Program Evaluation 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryk, A.S., & Raudenbush, S.W. (1983). The potential contribution of program evaluation to social problem solving: A view based on the CIS and Push/Excel experiences. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, D.T. (1984). Can we be scientific in applied social science? In R.F. Conner, D.G. Altman, and C. Jackson (Eds.), Evaluation Studies Review Annual Vol. 9. Beverly Hills: Sage, p. 26-48.

Cohen, D.K. (1983). Evaluation and reform. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cook. T.D. (1985). Postpositivist critical multiplism. In R.L. Shotland and M.M. Mark (Eds.), Social science and social policy. Beverly Hills: Sage, p. 21-62.

Cronbach, L.J., & Associates (1980). Toward reform of program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Donmoyer, R. (1983). Evaluation as deliberation: Issues, assumptions, and findings from an exploratory study. Final Report (NIE-G-81-0083) submitted to the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

Edwards, W., & Newman, J.R. (1982). Multiattribute evaluation. Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences 26. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gold, N. (1981). The stakeholder process in educational program evaluation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Gold, N. (1983). Stakeholders and program evaluation: Characterizations and reflections. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greene, J.C. (1985). Stakeholder participation in evaluation design: Is it worth the trouble? Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Evaluation Research Society, the Evaluation Network, and the Canadian Evaluation Society, Toronto.

Greene, J.C. (1984). Designing useful and high quality evaluations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Ellenville, NY.

Greene, J.C. (1983). Strategies for addressing both the politics and the technology of program evaluation. Program Evaluation Studies Paper Series No. 5. Department of Human Service Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1985). The countenances of fourth-generation evaluation: Description, judgment, and negotiation. Copyrighted manuscript.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leviton, L.D., & Hughes, E.F. (1981). Research on the utilization of evaluation: A review and synthesis. Evaluation Review, 5, 525-548.

Mark, M.M., & Shotland, R.L. (1985a). Stakeholder-based evaluation and value judgments. Evaluation Review, 9, 605-626.

Mark, M.M., & Shotland, R.L. (1985b). Toward more useful social science. In R.L. Shotland and M.M. Mark (Eds.), Social science and social policy. Beverly Hills: Sage, p. 335-370.

Murray, C.A. (1983). Stakeholders as deck chairs. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M.Q. (1978). Utilization-focused evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (nd). Six honest serving men for evaluation of farming systems research and extension. Caribbean Agricultural Extension Project, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Shapiro, J.S. (1983). Conceptualizing evaluation use: Implications of alternative models of organizational decision making. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Evaluation Research Society and the Evaluation Network, Chicago.

Smoler, T.D. (1984). Taking stakeholder-based evaluation one step further: A stakeholder-directed approach to evaluation. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Evaluation Research Society and the Evaluation Network, San Francisco.

Stake, R.E. (1975). Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Stake, R.E. (1983). Stakeholder influence in the evaluation of Cities-in-Schools. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, B., & King, J.A. (1981). Evaluation utilization: A literature review and research agenda. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Trochim, W.M.K. (1985). Pattern matching, validity, and conceptualization in program evaluation. Evaluation Review, 9, 575-604.

Trochim, W.M.K., & Linton, R. (in press). Conceptualization for planning and evaluation. Evaluation and Program Planning.

Weiss, C. (1983a). The stakeholder approach to evaluation: Origins and promise. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weiss, C. (1983b). Toward the future of stakeholder approaches in evaluation. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1

Issues and Lessons Learned About Participatory Evaluation

Issue	Lessons
What is the rationale for stakeholder participation in program evaluation? Suggested rationales: 1. increased utilization of evaluation results 2. empowerment of low status stakeholders 3. greater congruence with decision making process 4. greater scientific validity/credibility of results	* The theory and operationalization of stakeholder participation differ for different rationales. So, engaging multiple rationales within a single evaluation can be problematic. * Within a utilization rationale, uses should be considered broadly to encompass instrumental, conceptual, and symbolic uses of both the evaluation process and the evaluation results. * The utilization rationale has some empirical support, though its operational challenges remain considerable. Support for other rationales is less well established.
Who is a stakeholder? And who decides who is a stakeholder? As people whose lives are affected by the program and people whose decisions can affect the future of the program, stakeholders include: 1. people involved in developing and using the evaluand 2. beneficiaries of the evaluand 3. groups suffering a disadvantage related to the evaluand A related issue is the values associated with defining and selecting stakeholder participants.	* For a utilization-oriented participatory evaluation, an appropriate stakeholder participant is: 1. a legitimate stakeholder (a la Gold, 1981) 2. with sufficient program knowledge to contribute in ways meaningful to him/her and to the process 3. who defines him/herself as a participant * Within a utilization rationale, procedures for selecting stakeholder participants require further clarification of such concerns as: 1. Are representativeness and diversity appropriate and defensible selection criteria? 2. Should "sufficient program knowledge" be added to the selection criteria? 3. What problems are incurred when the selectors have strong biases?

Table 1 (continued)

Issue	Lessons
What is meaningful participation? Within the view of meaningful stakeholder participation as shared decision making, identified issues include the operational challenges of such a process, stakeholder difficulties in identifying their information needs, and stakeholder limitations in understanding the technical elements of evaluation.	* The operational challenges of shared decision making remain considerable, so participatory procedures remain a priority area for research. * Stakeholders <u>can</u> identify in advance their information needs, using one of several extant procedures. Moreover, meaningful stakeholder participation in this question-identification phase is integral to a utilization-oriented participatory approach. * Within a utilization rationale, a tenable shared decision model allocates responsibilility for substance to stakeholders and responsibility for process and technical work to evaluators.
For what kinds of evaluation and evaluation settings are participatory approaches most appropriate or most likely to be effective? Participatory approaches are possibly more appropriate for formative or process evaluations than for summative or product evaluations. The inherent pluralism of participatory approaches raises issues about serving multiple aims within a single study, including problems of: 1. achieving consensus on evaluation priorities 2. invoking a arbitrator role for evaluators 3. undermining technical quality 4. identifying appropriate settings for participatory evaluations and/or invoking the need to conduct multiple studies to respond to this pluralism.	* Utilization-oriented participatory approaches are appropriate for process evaluations and for local settings that are relatively conflict-free. * Further research is needed on this issue.

Table 1 (continued)

Issue	Lessons
What roles are required of a participatory evaluator? Suggested roles: 1. technical/methodological expert 2. teacher and learner 3. facilitator 4. arbitrator/negotiator A related issue is whether or not such multiple role expectations are unreasonably high.	* A participatory evaluator's roles are multiple and diverse. In a conflict-free setting with a utilization rationale, they include all of the suggested roles except arbitrator/negotiator. * Each role requires a distinct set of skills. Thus, participatory approaches may require evaluation teams vs. single evaluators.
What are the costs of participatory evaluation? Suggested costs: 1. increased burden (time, skills, risk of conflict) 2. conflicts with technical quality 3. threats to the knowledge production function of evaluation, e.g., for evaluation of demonstration programs	* In a (conflict-free) utilization-oriented participatory evaluation, the major burdens are increased time, increased length of the process, and additional skill requirements for both evaluators and stakeholders. * For a utilization rationale, an appropriate shared decision making model can avoid potential conflicts between use and quality by allocating to the evaluator latitude to safeguard technical quality.